



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

antithesis, still less a divorce, between economic technology and sociology; and that the organization of the two in his philosophy rested upon a general conception of the subordinate relationship of all specific activities within an inclusive moral system, to which, in effect, though not in detail, all students of society must ultimately return."

Probably most careful students of Adam Smith, taking account of the "Theory of Moral Sentiments" as well as the "Wealth of Nations," will admit that the great apostle of individual liberty was first a moral philosopher, and only secondarily an economist. This idea Professor Small develops in his own peculiar terminology, making abundant citations from the "Wealth of Nations." Adam Smith's social, or as our author prefers to call it, sociological point of view, is contrasted with that of the classical economists, who were so intent on increasing production as to forget that more wealth is worth while only as it means increased welfare, and that welfare depends quite as much on just distribution as on increased production.

The most interesting chapter in the book is that on "The Economics and Sociology of Labor," which contains a suggestive criticism of Adam Smith's use of the slippery word "natural," and our use of the equally elusive "normal." To assume that competition or the private ownership of land and machines, or any particular feature of the present system of distribution, is "normal," is to incur the danger of the question-begging epithet, no matter how carefully one may define his terms. Professor Small maintains that there is a fundamental difference between claims to material goods based on labor, and claims based on conventionality, the former being essential, the latter only institutional. We are unable to agree that labor itself constitutes a valid claim to income, as the argument of the book seems to indicate. Income from labor, no less than that from property, must justify itself on the ground of social utility.

To return to the argument of the book, economics is a purely technological discipline, judging conduct solely with reference to its effects on wealth. It furnishes an indispensable part of the data for that larger moral judgment which it is the special province of the sociologist to make, and which has for its criterion social welfare or progress. The claim advanced for sociology is not a particularly new one, but it is presented in a rather striking fashion. If one may judge at all by the recent literature of economics, however, the economists have no idea of letting themselves be shut up within the narrow bounds here laid down. Dispute as we may over names, the cheering fact remains that we are all beginning to study the social sciences from the viewpoint of human welfare.

H. R. MUSSEY.

University of Pennsylvania.

Smith, Samuel G. *The Industrial Conflict.* Pp. 217. Price, \$1.00. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1907.

This study, by a member of the department of sociology in the University of Minnesota, is said by its author to differ "from all that has been written

upon the question, in that it is not based upon a theoretic, but a real world, and, instead of seeking to serve some theory, endeavors to show the actual grounds upon which the whole subject rests, and, rejecting both matters of method and incidental questions, to set in a clear light the issues involved" (p. 8). Two chapters consist of reprints of letters received from labor leaders and employers. In the discussion of these letters, the author emphasizes many of the elementary truths of political economy in a readable manner, and even for those who have some acquaintance with the literature of the labor question, it may be convenient to have the demands of employers and employed brought together in one place. In the chapter on the "Three Parties in Interest" it would have been well to analyze the concept of "the public," viewed as a distinct group from employers and employed. In the final chapter socialism is judged adversely. Dr. Smith asserts that under socialism the management of industry would be either by a caste system the worst the world has ever known or else by the general average of intelligence, which would check production. There would be no incentive to the individual to put forth all his powers. Finally he rejects socialism because it is an assault on the family and is anti-patriotic. The attempted distinction between political and economic socialism is not clear.

M. O. LORENZ.

University of Wisconsin.

Speed, Thomas. *The Union Cause in Kentucky. 1860-1865.* Pp. xv, 355. Price, \$2.50. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1907.

No part of the history of the Civil War is more deserving of investigation than that played by the border states. Up to the present time, however, the internal history of these states has been inadequately presented, especially the part played by the Union men in keeping these states from joining the Southern Confederacy.

It is with these convictions that Captain Speed has prepared the present volume. While much has been written to celebrate the deeds of those Kentuckians who went into the Confederacy he believes that the services of the Kentucky Unionists have been underestimated and misrepresented. The truthfulness and fairness of the author's account is testified to by Justice John M. Harlan, of the United States Supreme Court, in an appreciative introduction. Both Justice Harlan and the author call attention to the fact that even as able and unprejudiced a writer as the late Professor Shaler, of Harvard, in his history of his native state has gravely erred and given currency to a gross misconception, when he wrote that "the Blue Grass region sent the greater part of its men of the richer families into the Confederate army, while the Union troops, . . . came in greater abundance from those who dwelt on thinner soils," and that the former were as a whole, "a finer body of men than the Federal troops from the commonwealth." Captain Speed refutes this statement in Chapters VI and XI by marshaling a long list of Union leaders from prominent families and by a comparison of the records of the Union and Confederate troops from